

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, the Examiner has issued a restriction requirement between Group I (claims 1-16,18-19, and 21-26; Group II (Claim 17) and Group III (Claim 20). Applicants hereby confirm the election to prosecute the claims of Group I. Claims 17 and 20, have nevertheless been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1 so that these claims may be considered for rejoinder.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. The Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for this indication, and have taken the Examiner's suggestion and modified claim 1 to add the limitations that were originally contained in claim 12. Applicants have also added these limitations to claims 17 and 20, in the hopes that these claims may be considered for rejoinder. Claims 9-12 were canceled as a result of the changes to Claim 1. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application to pursue the subject matter which was originally claimed, but which has been removed from the claims by the above amendments.

With the above amendments, Applicants believe that the remaining rejections as to double patenting and under 35 USC § 102(b) and 103 have been made moot.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the detailed statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, and would like to add that the art of record does not teach the use of the indicated materials to join substrates or objects, such as in roofing membranes or for joining pipe components.

Accordingly, based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicants courteously request that the rejections be withdrawn and the case passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

June 9, 2009

/James T. Hoppe/

James T. Hoppe

Registration No. 35,899

Phone: 979-238-9039

P. O. Box 1967

Midland, MI 48641-1967

JTH/mr